

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-23, 25-69, and 71-111 were presented for examination and pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1, 3-23, 25-69, and 71-111 were rejected. Claim 71 and the specification also objected to. With this amendment, claim 71 is amended, and claims 10-15, 17, 20-22, 32-37, 39, 42-44, 55-60, 62, 65-67, 72-77, 79, 82-90, 92, 95-97, 99-104, 106, and 109-111 are canceled. On the basis of the amendments and following remarks, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all pending claims are requested.

I. Drawings

Applicants enclose herewith replacement drawing sheets for the marked-up corrected drawings for Figures 1 and 3, submitted on April 7, 2003.

II. Objections

In response to the objections, Applicants have amended the specification and claim 71 as suggested by the examiner.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9, 16, 18, 23, 25-28, 31, 38, 40, 45-49, 54, 61, 63, 68, 71, 78, 80, 91, 93, and 105 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,383,077 to Kweitko et al. However, Kweitko cannot qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) if the claimed subject matter was invented before Kweitko's filing date of October 3, 2000. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention was conceived and reduced to practice before this date, and that the claimed invention was diligently reduced to constructive practice from this date through the preparation and filing of related U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/245,903. To establish

prior invention and thus overcome the rejection based on Kweitko, Applicants submit herewith for each named inventor a declaration and supporting exhibit pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131.

IV. Claim Rejections – Statutory Double Patenting

The examiner rejected the claims under statutory double patenting based on the claims of related co-pending U.S. Application No. 09/782,677. Applicants have canceled claims 10-15, 17, 20-22, 32-37, 39, 42-44, 55-60, 62, 65-67, 72-77, 79, 82-90, 92, 95-97, 99-104, 106, and 109-111, but respectfully traverse this rejection as to the claims not canceled.

Each of the claims of co-pending U.S. Application No. 09/782,677 recite that the service scheduling is according to “at least a value of the customer,” while none of the remaining claims are directed to service scheduling based on customer value. Because the pending claims are not the same as those pending in the ‘677 application, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection of claims 10-15, 21, 22, 32-37, 43, 44, 55-60, 66, 67, 72-77, 83-90, 96, 97, 99-102, 110, and 111 as obvious in view of Kweitko in view of Boushy is moot because these claims have been canceled.

VI. Conclusion

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants’ representative would help advance the prosecution of this

case to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK C. PACE & THOMAS W. COOK

Dated: May 26, 2004

By: Robert A. Hulse

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473

Attorney for Applicant

Fenwick & West LLP

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Tel.: (415) 875-2444

Fax: (415) 281-1350